

MEETING SUMMARY | Dinkey Collaborative Full Group

January 16, 2014

Dinkey Landscape Restoration Project, Sierra National Forest

Meeting Synopsis

At its January 16 meeting, the Landscape Planning Work Group (LPWG) briefed the full group on the planning timeline for the Exchequer project. One of the key elements included in this timeline is the establishment of a project boundary that considers cumulative effects and prescribed fire. The LPWG also updated the full group on the progress of the conceptual framework designed for analyzing these cumulative effects. As done each year, members reexamined the progress and completion of the 2013 goals, and recommended revisions to the 2014 Collaborative Goals. Marking a milestone, the Collaborative recommended a final prescribed Fire Prioritization Criteria. The group also reviewed outreach and recruitment efforts, including a draft letter to the Region requesting the periodic attendance of the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP) Coordinator. In addition, the group received an update from the Prescribed Fire Work Group (PFWG) regarding the meeting agenda for their Friday meeting, and a letter to the Forest and Region regarding the importance of the prescribed fire program. The full group also discussed the collaborative adaptive management process and provided feedback on the draft framework for these activities within the Dinkey Collaborative. Members evaluated a PowerPoint presented by the Communication Work Group, and suggested revisions. Finally, members reviewed a summarization of the 2013 evaluation results and discussed any improvements that could be made to make the Collaborative more effective. The full Collaborative will meet again in March 2014.

Contents

Meeting Synopsis	1
Action Items	2
1. Welcome and Introductions	2
2. Interested Party Comment Period	3
3. Landscape Planning Update: Cumulative Effects	3
4. 2013 and 2014 Collaborative Goals	5
5. Prescribed Fire Prioritization Criteria	5
6. General Updates	6
7. Prescribed Fire Planning, Letter, and Budget	7
8. Discussion of Adaptive Management Process	8
9. Communication Materials	9
10. 2013 Evaluation Summary	10
11. Attendees:	10

This meeting summary paraphrases individual comments and suggestions from Dinkey Collaborative members. Statements do not indicate consensus of the group unless they are preceded by the words, "AGREEMENT:".

All materials are available to members on DataBasin.org, and general information is available on the Dinkey Collaborative website, www.fs.usda.gov/goto/sierra/dinkeycollaborative For questions please contact the facilitator, Mr. Dorian Fougères, at dfougeres@ccp.csus.edu or (916) 531-3835.

Action Items

1. **The facilitator** draft a charge for the Collaborative Liaison to Interdisciplinary Team.
2. **The facilitator** revise the 2013 and 2014 goals documents.
3. **Ms. Ballard** distribute a link to the Collaborative for the technical document, [RMRS-GTR[87, Hardy et al 2001] referenced on page 1, 1A.
4. **The facilitator and Communication Work Group** schedule a Collaborative briefing with Mr. Sherlock and ideally Mr. Gyant.
5. **Mr. Ashley and the facilitator** revise the CFLRP Coordinator letter and solicit feedback from Collaborative members regarding any content revisions.
6. **The facilitator and Steering Committee** contact Collaborative members and request questions to be sent to the Deputy Regional Forester.
7. **Ms. Ballard, Mr. Goode and the facilitator** revise the information and statistics in the second paragraph of the Prescribed Fire Letter and provide a reference to cultural burning.
8. **Mr. Ashley and the facilitator** highlight the accomplishments that have been made thus far and flag the goals for the upcoming year.
9. **Mr. Thomas, Ms. Roberts, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Tuitele-Lewis, and the facilitator** revise the Collaborative Adaptive Management Framework document and distribute it to Collaborative members prior to recommending it at an upcoming meeting.
10. **Ms. Flick** revise the Frequently Asked Questions document.
11. **Ms. Reynolds** revise the PowerPoint presentation and circulate it via the facilitator to all Collaborative members.
12. **The facilitator** summarize the Collaborative logo design and request and distribute associated photographs with the help of **Ms. Stacy, Ms. Flick, and SNF Public Affairs Officer.**
13. **The Facilitator** compare the most recent evaluation results from 2013 with those from previous years beginning with 2011 in an effort to track Collaborative progress.
14. **Collaborative members** advocate for the Forest filling the Deputy District Manager position.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Ray Porter, District Ranger, represented Sierra National Forest and welcomed members to the full Collaborative meeting. Dorian Fougères, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) Facilitator, reviewed the agenda items, meeting ground rules, and conducted member

introductions. The Collaborative agreed to strike the February 20th meeting from the schedule and proceed with the March 20th meeting.

2. Interested Party Comment Period

There were no public comments at this time.

3. Landscape Planning Update: Cumulative Effects

Mr. Rich Bagley reviewed key discussion points from the December 6th and January 15th meetings.

December 6th Meeting Highlights

- The need for careful consideration when setting a historical baseline against which to compare current forest conditions and assesses likely future changes.
- Habitat connectivity and fragmentation is a critical landscape scale issue.
- Distance between projects and associated buffers and boundaries are important to the analysis.
- Impacts can be ameliorated by revising project design measures and/or sequencing and separating treatments in space and time.
- Multiple scales are involved in the analysis, with some phenomena like fisher sub-populations existing at the landscape scale, foraging behavior at the home range or sub-watershed scale, and denning at the stand scale.
- The similarity between species such as spotted owl and fisher that would aid in the application of a similar analytical process.
- The need to represent the data visually to reflect how projects are adjacent or separated in both time and space.

January 15th Meeting Highlights

- Review of a recent General Technical Report on monitoring that identified the need for conceptual models for organizing the stressors and habitat associated with each species in question.
- The draft conceptual model for fisher that included four main components: dispersal habitat, foraging habitat, resting habitat, and reproductive habitat. These types of habitat are generally assessed at different scales -- dispersal at the landscape scale, foraging and resting at the fisher home range scale and reproductive habitat at the stand scale.
 - When looking at the home range scale the group discussed focusing on an assessment of the pace, extent, and intensity of treatments applied to the area.
- Looking ahead to the Exchequer project, and desire to clarify the project boundary in March, the group has developed a rough work plan. Items to be developed include, a draft of the fisher and owl conceptual models, forest restoration objectives, as well as fire, vegetation, and wildlife objectives. From this information, the group will develop

an index value that allows for comparing the sensitivity of different parts of Exchequer to restoration treatments.

- With the completion of these tasks, the Work Group will report to the full Collaborative in March to recommend a proposal for how to structure the Exchequer project boundary in a way that will minimize potential cumulative impacts to fisher and owl while still meeting other forest restoration objectives like fuels management and vegetation management.

Discussion Followed:

- There was concern that looking at the historical data may not be ideal in all circumstances and that each individual species and case of environmental conditions should be considered and analyzed in great detail.
 - Members of the Work Group responded by clarifying that both the historical and present conditions are all being considered and that this issue is one that the Forest staff is dealing with regularly, and is under intense pressure to change. The primary reason for addressing this issue is to help to make the NEPA process more efficient by addressing cumulative effects at the start of each project, rather than analyzing them at the end of planning.
 - Exchequer is an opportunity to apply this proactive approach to managing cumulative effects.
- With the revision of the Forest Plan coming up, it was suggested that both fisher and owl be integrated into the new plan.
- Planned timeline for the progress of the Exchequer Project.
 - The facilitator reviewed the project planning timeline, pointing out that it would be in the best interest of the Collaborative to strategically focus on the areas of the project that would benefit the Collaborative the most before the November deadline.
 - Having an ambitious timeline like this provides motivation to increase efficiency and will aid in the process of conducting cumulative effects analyses within the NEPA timeline.
 - Create a working group that would have the ability to work with more technical detail on the planning process.
- The facilitator provided the group with the option for an Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) liaison that would assist with technical dialogue during work group meetings, and would be responsible for bringing the technical conversation to the full Collaborative.
 - While the NEPA process separates staff work from public input, it would be beneficial to utilize the liaison to their full potential during the planning process that comes before NEPA is initiated.
 - The intent would be to include people in the conversation, but find a balance between having too many people which makes the process more inefficient.

ACTION ITEM: The facilitator draft a charge for the Collaborative Liaison to Interdisciplinary Team.

4. 2013 and 2014 Collaborative Goals

The facilitator reviewed the handout of Collaborative goals that had been completed, removed or still in progress from 2013. The majority of these goals had been accomplished, there were a few that were still in progress, but were on track to be completed within their timelines. For the 2014 goals, the facilitator also gave a brief update on the progress of each goal and asked the Collaborative for any additions or revisions that should be made to the list.

Proposed Revisions for 2014 Goals:

Goal #2:

- Revise current title language to read “Prescribed Fire” instead of “Landscape Planning” because of its affiliation with the work done in the new Prescribed Fire Work Group.

Goal #5:

- Adopt a complete Socioeconomic Monitoring Plan including the identification of additional socioeconomic monitoring activities.

Additional Proposed Goals:

- Produce the first monitoring report on activities conducted.
- Begin planning for the 2015 science symposium.
- Complete the National Indicators Report to Congress.
- Conduct a survey regarding public perception of forest restoration activities.

ACTION ITEM: The facilitator revise the 2013 and 2014 goals documents

AGREEMENT: Members adopted the revised 2014 goals with the preceding amendments.

Members in consensus: Mr. Augustine, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Haze, Mr. Bagley, Mr. Harger, Ms. Reynolds, Ms. Dyer, Mr. Duysen, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Smith, Ms. Flick, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Connor, Mr. Van Velsor, Mr. Goode, Ms. Vance, Ms. Stacy, and Mr. Hansen, Mr. Kaminski

5. Prescribed Fire Prioritization Criteria

The facilitator asked the Collaborative for any additional suggested edits to the Prescribed Fire Prioritization Criteria.

Proposed Revisions:

- Page 1, 1A: Provide a Fire Regime class / Condition class classification chart representing the information
- Page 2, 2A: provide a table laying out the past projects and the progress that has been made.
- Amend the language to clarify the concept and definition of the “Cultural Burn.”

ACTION ITEM: Ms. Ballard distribute a link to the Collaborative for the technical document, [RMRS-GTR-87, Hardy et al 2001] referenced on page 1, 1A.

http://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs/rmrs_gtr087.pdf

AGREEMENT: Members adopted the proposed Prescribed Fire Prioritization Criteria with the preceding amendments.

Members in consensus: Mr. Augustine, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Haze, Mr. Bagley, Mr. Harger, Ms. Reynolds, Ms. Dyer, Mr. Duysen, Mr. Stewart, Ms. Flick, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Van Velsor, Mr. Goode, Ms. Vance, Ms. Stacy, and Mr. Hansen, and Mr. Kaminski

Members who stood aside: Mr. Augustine, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Connor

6. General Updates

Ms. Ballard reviewed the handout regarding general project updates. The following reflects any changes not represented on the handout.

Soaproot Stewardship Addition

- The Clarence Burn was a part of the decision document and lighting has begun on and continues to be active in some regions surrounding a fisher den. PSW employee and fisher safety are being considered.
- The \$350,000 grant request, if awarded, will be part of the accomplishments of the full Collaborative and funds will be considered “matching funds.”

Fire Restrictions:

- Fire restrictions are being put back into place on the Sierra and Sequoia National Forests as the drought conditions continue to increase. Current conditions reflect the conditions normally seen in August and fire stations are being staffed full time to assist in active fires occurring across the state.

Letters to PSW, SJVAPCD, KRCD, and KRWA:

- Letters to PSW and SJVAPCD have both been sent to the respective contacts.
- Letters have been sent to the KRCD and KRWA and have received interest from Mr. Steve Stadler, Deputy General Manager for Water Resources.
- As a result of the Collaborative interest, there was a proposal to have a panel of specialized speakers address the issue of water resources.

Letters to CFLRP Regional Coordinator:

- The support and participation of Mr. Joe Sherlock, the CFLRP Regional Coordinator would benefit the Collaborative by acting as a link to communication between this and other Regional Collaboratives.
- His support may be more effective if he periodically has the opportunity to see the progress being made throughout the year on projects such as the Monitoring Plans, Landscape Planning efforts, Fisher Marking Guidelines, and the Cumulative Effects Models.
- May also be beneficial to utilize him in refining the communication efforts of each of the Collaborative by presenting briefings in collaboration with the Communication Work Group.

ACTION ITEM: The facilitator and Communication Work Group schedule a Collaborative briefing with Mr. Sherlock and ideally Mr. Gyant.

ACTION ITEM: Mr. Ashley and the facilitator revise the CFLRP Coordinator letter and solicit feedback from Collaborative members regarding any content revisions.

ACTION ITEM: The facilitator and Steering Committee contact Collaborative members and request questions to be sent to the Deputy Regional Forester.

Region 2 and Region 3 CLFR meetings:

- Five Collaboratives attended, each providing updates. The primary topic of conversation was the adaptive NEPA process.

Deputy District Ranger:

- Mr. Gus Smith will hopefully be arriving in February for a 4 month detail and may be given the opportunity to apply for the permanent position.

7. Prescribed Fire Planning, Letter, and Budget

Ms. Ballard discussed the Prescribed Fire Working Group's First meeting to be held on January 17th and the agenda items that would be covered. Collaborative members also suggested revisions to the National Supervisor.

Proposed revisions:

- Correct capital language and make the “I” in “Dinkey Landscape” from the first paragraph, a lowercase letter.
- Provide the historical background of “prescribed fire” and “managed fire” in the third paragraph.

ACTION ITEM: Ms. Ballard, Mr. Goode and the facilitator revise the information and statistics in the second paragraph and provide a reference to cultural burning.

ACTION ITEM: Mr. Ashley and the facilitator highlight the accomplishments that have been made thus far and flag the goals for the upcoming year.

AGREEMENT: Collaborative members agreed to be signatories on the letter to Dean Gould, Forest Supervisor.

Members in consensus: Mr. Augustine, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Haze, Mr. Bagley, Mr. Harger, Ms. Reynolds, Ms. Dyer, Mr. Duysen, Mr. Stewart, Ms. Flick, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Van Velsor, Mr. Goode, Ms. Vance, Ms. Stacy, and Mr. Hansen, Mr. Kaminski Mr. Smith, and Mr. Connor

Members who stood aside: Mr. Augustine

8. Discussion of Adaptive Management Process

Mr. Thomas reviewed the handout and the key highlights that it covered. The document identified the major activities in the Collaborative Adaptive Management Process including the four types of Adaptive Management (AM)—Ad Hoc AM, Project Planning AM, Species-Specific AM and Landscape AM. It also outlines information on conducting the Annual Monitoring review, as well as an Application of Review and the 2015 Science and Monitoring Symposium. The document was reviewed and revised by Collaborative members.

Proposed Revisions:

- Revise the language in the first paragraph to clarify that the ecological monitoring plan and the socioeconomic monitoring plan are thought of as a whole, and should be identified as the “monitoring plan.”
- 1A. Ad Hoc AM: Revise the language in the following sentence, “The details of the adjustments are unplanned...” by removing the phrase, “are unplanned, yet.”
- 1B. Project Planning AM: Add language around “doesn’t exclude the ability of the forest and the staff to do similar review and analysis.”
- Clarify the language in the opening paragraph to better identify the purpose of the document.

ACTION ITEM: Mr. Thomas, Ms. Roberts, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Tuitele-Lewis, and the Facilitator, revise the Collaborative Adaptive Management Framework document based on proposed edits and distribute it to Collaborative members prior to recommending it at an upcoming meeting.

9. Communication Materials

The new Communication Work Group Co-Lead, Ms. Reynolds, presented drafts of the PowerPoint and Frequently Asked Questions that had been developed for the November socioeconomic public meetings, and sought revisions on both from Collaborative members.

Proposed Revisions for the PowerPoint:

- Utilize more photographs to represent the issues and the progress that has been made in the Collaborative, rather than an abundance of text.
- In the “Partners” slide, amend the list to say, “land owners, other interested parties and many others.”
- In the “Vision and Goals” slide, divide the information into multiple slides and use more photographs.
- Add the contact information of the facilitator and/or the future District Ranger.
- Adjust the PowerPoint to be more audience specific based on each different presentation.

Proposed Revisions for the Frequently Asked Questions:

- Divide each of the questions regarding funding, participation, etc. into sections.
- Ensure that the document has no unspoiled acronyms.
- Keep language simple and accessible, it should be understandable to any kind of audience. Revise some of the language and shorten sentences, possibly add some bullets (e.g., question 3).
- Clarify early on that the Collaborative is a 10-year commitment.
- In the first answer, amend the language by adding, “and tree thinning.” Additionally, consider adding a reference to cultural burning given its new emphasis.
- In the second answer, update last sentence per brochure language. Revise the area to highlight the Shaver Lake community. Explain in better detail the community benefits including, economic vitality, jobs, and protection from wildfire.
- Update answer atop page 2 regarding the Collaborative representation to include, “land owners, other interested parties and many others.”
- Update the Funding answer on page 2 by focusing more on Dinkey specific money and acreage. Date the Title IV reference.
- Create a new section for NEPA that includes the definition and historical background.
 - See Charter language regarding not abrogating anyone’s right to NEPA.
 - Explain Dinkey input is pre-NEPA planning.
 - Add CSUS after Center for Collaborative Policy to read, “Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS.”

ACTION ITEM: Ms. Reynolds revise the PowerPoint presentation and circulate it via the facilitator to all Collaborative members.

ACTION ITEM: Ms. Flick revise the Frequently Asked Questions document.

Collaborative Logo Design:

The facilitator began the brainstorming process to ultimately find a Collaborative logo that would reflect what the Collaborative does as a group. It is important to find images that reflect the work being done and the people that represent the Collaborative. Ideas spanned from wildlife on the landscape to a vision of a healthy forest versus an unhealthy one. Progress is still being made on the design.

ACTION ITEM: The facilitator summarize the Collaborative logo design and request and distribute associated photographs with the help of Ms. Stacy, Ms. Flick, and SNF Public Affairs Officer.

10. 2013 Evaluation Summary

The facilitator reviewed the results of the 2013 Evaluation and provided examples of written comments from each of the questions.

- Many of the responses highlighted the benefits of being able to get to know one another better to build up the trust within the Collaborative.
- One reoccurring concern was the potential lack of attention to detail by some members during negotiation.
- There was also concern that there was not enough public communication on the socioeconomic benefits, and that there should be better representation of local and non-local benefits.

ACTION ITEM: The facilitator compare the most recent evaluation results from 2013 with those from previous years beginning with 2011.

ACTION ITEM: Collaborative members advocate for the Forest filling the Deputy District Manager position.

11. Attendees

- | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Emily Adams, CCP | 4. Rich Bagley | 6. Kim Coleman |
| 2. Chip Ashley | 5. Carolyn Ballard, | 7. Narvell Conner |
| 3. Justin Augustine | USFS | 8. Kent Duysen |

9. Brittany Dyer
10. Pamela Flick
11. Dorian Fougères,
CCP
12. Marcia Freedman
13. Hon. Ron Goode
14. Dean Gould, USFS
15. Brian Hansen
16. Stan Harger

17. Steve Haze
18. Andy Hosford,
USFS
19. Joe Kaminski
20. Ray Porter, USFS
21. Justine Reynolds
22. Mark Smith
23. Ben Solvesky
24. Erin Stacy

25. John Stewart
26. Craig Thomas
27. Craig Thompson,
USFS
28. Stan Van Velsor
29. Mandy Vance